

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated December 20, 2005, the claims have not been amended. Claims 1-39 remain in the application. Re-consideration of the application is requested.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraph (3) of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 8-15, 17, 21-28, 30, and 34-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beezer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,597,314 in view of Gudorf et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0174230 (Gudorf) and further in view of Werner, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0196942 (Werner). In paragraph (4) of the Office Action, claims 3, 5-7, 16, 18-20, 29, and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beezer in view of Gudorf and Werner and further in view of Lim, U.S. Patent No. 6,434,619 (Lim).

Specifically, the independent claims were rejected as follows:

With regard to claims 1:

As illustrated in Fig. 3, and as described (column 4, lines 55-63), Beezer discloses a computer-implemented 200 method for presenting a series of titles 310 (help source file) of a document to a user.

As per the step of "maintaining a help", the method of Beezer includes presenting (maintaining) a set of help topics or series of titles to be selected by a user (column 4, lines 55-63);

As per the step of "receiving request", the method of Beezer includes receiving a signal corresponding to a user request for the help and settings control document (column 9, lines 16-17 of claim 2).

As per the step of "obtaining help", the method of Beezer includes determining (obtaining) the target part of the help and settings control document based on a navigational history associated with the user (column 6, lines 46-56, column 9, lines 6-10 of claim 1);

As per the step of "displaying", the method of Beezer further includes displaying a configured (customized) display of the help and settings control document (help source file) based on stored navigational history component 704 and user profile component 708 (column 7, lines 53-column 8, lines 22).

Beezer, however, does not teach, "the help history file comprises a cookie, generated by the local computer, wherein an identification for each previously opened file is stored in the cookie." Gudorf, on the other hand, teaches cookies 110 stored on the computer platform 98 (local computer) provide information as to previously viewed content, i.e., history file (paragraph 46).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the cookie of Gudorf for the pointer of Beezer because the help document of Beezer will be able to identify the user and matches user's activity when a user logs for the second time, i.e., the user does not have to retype the previously entered information.

Furthermore, while Beezer in view of Gudorf discloses a cookie, e.g. corresponding to the context a user navigates to (Gudorf, paragraph 46), but Beezer in view of Gudorf fails to disclose that *the cookie is generated locally by a client computer.* Werner, however, discloses a cookie file that is created on a client computer 502 (paragraph 26),

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Werner's locally generated cookie with Beezer in view of Gudorf. The motivation/suggestion for doing so will be to provide a client-side control of generating cookies, and the cookie provides usage information of the stored file.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Beezer, Gudorf and Werner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With regard to claims 14, 15, 17 and 22-26:

Beezer, Gudorf and Warner are also directed and disclose a computer-implemented help system reciting all the limitations of these claims in system form (e.g., see Beezer, claim 1). Thus, since these claims correspond generally to method claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, respectively, and recite similar features in system form, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

With regard to claims 27, 28, 30 and 35-39:

Beezer, Gudorf and Warner are also directed and disclose a computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing a method of providing a user access to help and settings control document (e.g., see Beezer, claim 5). Thus, since these claims correspond generally to method claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, respectively, and recite similar features in storage form, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

With this response, Applicants submits a declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 that indicates a date of invention prior to May 15, 2001. Applicants further note that the Gudorf filing date was May 15, 2001 and the Werner filing date is June 22, 2001. Accordingly, the declaration eliminates the use of both Gudorf and Werner as valid prior art references.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully solicits the same.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael C. Morrison

By their attorneys,

GATES & COOPER LLP

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: March 1, 2006

By: 
Name: Jason S. Feldman
Reg. No.: 39,187